The Mesa Refinery Watch Group

DERAIL THE SPUR

MESA REFINERY WATCH GROUP

32 CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE PHILLIPS 66 "RAIL SPUR" PROJECT

SUBMITTED TO THE SLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

8/24/16



TABLE OF CONTENTS: CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Introduction: When Imposing Conditions, Commissioners Must Remember That 10 Class I Impacts Remain

- 1. Exact Conditions Of Operation Must Be Specified
- 2. The Maximum Number Of Trains Unloaded Per Year Must Be Specified
- 3. Phillips Must Provide A Plan For Track Construction
- 4. Onsite At The Refinery -- Phillips Must Own And Operate The Least Polluting Locomotives
- 5. The Need For A Detailed Plan Regarding Phillips' Approach To Reducing Diesel Particulate Pollution Emanating From The Rail Terminal
- 6. No Diesel Locomotives Operated During Days Of Air Pollution Health Risk
- 7. Restrictions On The Idling Of Trains
- 8. The Fence Line Around The Rail Terminal And Refinery Must Meet EPA Monitoring Standards
- 9. The Petroleum Coke From Tar Sands Must Be Studied And Its Dust Must Be Mitigated
- 10. Limiting The Destruction Of The Buffer Zone
- 11. Increasing The Buffer Zone By Reducing The Length Of Crude Oil Trains
- 12. Onsite At The Refinery -- Specific Locomotive And Rail Terminal Shut Down Times
- 13. Strict Limitations On Noise Levels
- 14. Creation Of Visual Models Of What The Rail Terminal Will Look Like
- 15. Installation Of Landscape Screening
- 16. A Berm That Is Far Higher Than Indicated In The Final EIR
- 17. Reduced Lighting At Night
- 18. Odors From The Crude Oil Unloading Facility Must Be Monitored And Contained
- 19. Onsite At The Refinery -- Utilization Of Only State-Of-The-Art Crude Oil Tankers
- 20. Onsite At The Refinery -- All Trains Must Be Equipped With Positive Train Control Braking Systems

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, continued

- 21. The Training That Phillips Workers Must Have When Working Under A Crude-By-Rail Delivery Model Must Be Specified In Detail
- 22. An Enforcement Fund And Random Inspections By The County To Ensure Compliance With Conditions Of Approval
- 23. Phillips Must Pay To Relocate Schools In The Blast Zone
- 24. Phillips Must Pay To Train Teachers About Response To Crude Oil Train Derailments
- 25. Phillips Must Pay For Updated Hospital Disaster Preparedness And County-Wide Drills
- 26. Phillips Must Pay To Train All Emergency Service Responders In SLO County
- 27. Phillips Must Pay For Firefighting Foam & Equipment
- 28. Phillips Must Post A Bond To Address The Issue Of Potential Damage To Residents, Property And The Environment
- 29. An Array Of Conditions Must Be Imposed During Construction Of The Rail Terminal
- 30. Each Month There Will Be A Complete Review Of All Impacts And Compliance Issues
- 31. Phillips Must Maintain A Complaint Line For Use By The Public And Respond In A Timely Manner
- 32. If Phillips Rejects Or Defeats The Conditions Of Approval, The County Must Adopt A "Poison Pill"

INTRODUCTION:

When Imposing Conditions, Our Planning Commissioners Must Remember That <u>10</u> Class I Impacts Remain Under The "Three-Train Alternative"

As our Planning Commissioners decide upon conditions of approval, they <u>must</u> bear in mind that 10 Class I impacts <u>continue</u> to exist even with Phillips' three-train alternative. The <u>cumulative weight</u> of these Class I impacts means <u>no</u> set of conditions outweighs their responsibility to deny this project. The 10 Class I impacts on our County's citizens are ...

- 1. Activities at the <u>refinery</u> and on the mainline would generate <u>criteria pollutant emissions</u> exceeding SLO County APCD thresholds.
- 2. Activities at the <u>refinery</u> and on the mainline would generate <u>greenhouse gas emissions</u> exceeding SLO County APCD thresholds.
- 3. Union Pacific mainline emissions would remain Class I.
- 4. Mainline rail toxic emissions would remain Class I.
- 5. The risk of <u>spills and fires</u> on the mainline would remain Class I.
- 6. The increased demand for <u>fire protection and emergency response</u> on the mainline would remain Class I.
- 7. Oil spills along the Union Pacific mainline would remain Class I.
- 8. The impact on water resources along the Union Pacific mainline would remain Class I.
- 9. The impact on biological resources along the Union Pacific mainline would remain Class I.
- 10. And, the impact on <u>cultural resources</u> along the Union Pacific mainline would remain Class I.

The primary duty of our Commissioners is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>. It is <u>not</u> to protect the commercial or property rights of a <u>corporation</u>, especially when that corporation seeks to disregard and trample the property and human rights of <u>citizens</u>.

Therefore, there is neither a single nor a full set of conditions under which this Commission should approve this project to overcome 10 Class I, <u>significant and unavoidable</u> impacts ... either at the refinery and/or on the mainline.

However, <u>only</u> because the Commission is now developing conditions of approval, and in order to put all conditions into the official record, the Mesa Refinery Watch Group is submitting the conditions listed on the following pages. We ask that <u>all</u> of them be included in the final conditions.

1. Exact Conditions Of Operation Must Be Specified*

SLO County has <u>never</u> before been home to a crude oil rail terminal. It has never had to understand and regulate how such a terminal operates, its impact on citizens, and what's required to protect the environment and health and safety of the public.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- a highly detailed document must be developed which <u>explains</u> and <u>regulates</u>, on Phillips' property, <u>where</u> trains will move, how locomotives will <u>uncouple and couple</u>, how <u>long</u> each operation will take, other <u>vehicles</u> and machinery that will be required, the type of <u>personnel</u> involved and what their <u>activities</u> will be, and so forth.

As Commissioner Jim Irving stated -- these details "must be <u>nailed down rock solid</u>." As the document is developed, special attention must be paid to specifications for limiting the impacts on the <u>neighboring</u> communities.

2. The Maximum Number Of Trains Unloaded Per Year Must Be Specified*

Phillips initially proposed "up to <u>five</u> trains per week." When that proved to be unacceptable in terms of impacts, they said - "Okay, if that doesn't work, how about <u>three</u> trains per week?" So they'll obviously do anything to get their foot in the door in terms of crude oil trains. For now, they only want to be a "<u>little</u> rail pregnant."

We cannot afford to give them the slightest opening to bring in <u>more</u> trains, tankers or amount of oil than they tell us at this point. There must be <u>no ambiguity</u>.

Therefore -- the three-train per week alternative must be stated in writing in <u>far greater detail</u>, in both the <u>project description</u> and as a <u>condition of approval</u>.

For example -- if the maximum number of annual trains or tankers are unloaded within the first 10 months of the year, we must be assured that <u>no further trains</u>, <u>tankers or amount of oil</u> will arrive or be unloaded until the following year. And if Phillips intends to increase the number of trains, tankers or amount of oil, an entirely new EIR and hearing process must begin. We cannot accept <u>verbal</u> promises about something as important as this. It must all be specified in writing.

The County Planning Department must identify specific enforcement <u>standards</u> for this condition and assign significant <u>penalties</u> for noncompliance with the standards.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its <u>entirety</u> is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask that our Planning Commissioners remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

3. Phillips Must Provide A Plan For Track Construction*

A major cause of derailments is <u>track failure</u> ... including tracks failing due to the weight of crude oil trains, sheared lag bolts, etc.

Therefore as a condition of approval -- Phillips must provide the County with <u>track construction</u> specifications for their new rail terminal. The construction specifications must conform with the requirements of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 213 for Class 5 track consistent with the mainline design standard; and, also the Federal Railroad Administration's "Track and Rail Infrastructure Integrity Compliance Manual." This includes, but is not limited to roadbed construction, track geometry, and track structure; and, construction materials, testing, methods, and technologies.

Inspection during initial track construction, and for all subsequent maintenance and track rehabilitation must be performed by inspectors qualified in accordance with 49 CFR 219.7, and shall also be guided by the FRA's "Track and Rail Infrastructure Integrity Compliance Manual".

4. Onsite At The Refinery -- Phillips Must Own And Operate The Least Polluting Locomotives*

During these hearings, evidence was submitted regarding how harmful <u>diesel emissions</u> are to citizens' health - <u>no-one</u> disputes it. Yet, each train entering, exiting and moving around the Nipomo refinery will be pulled by <u>three</u> locomotives, each spewing toxic diesel emissions.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- the locomotives operating at the refinery must be <u>owned</u> by Phillips and operated by its <u>employees</u>. This will <u>eliminate</u> any issues of federal preemption regarding <u>who</u> is in control of the trains -- it would be an <u>oil</u> company, not a railroad, responsible for <u>controlling</u> the on-site emissions.

Additionally, these locomotives must be the latest available, <u>state-of-the-art</u>, least polluting yard engines available at the time. Whether they be the model <u>Tier 4</u> engines, <u>hybrid</u> yard engines, or any that ultimately supersede Tier 4 and current hybrid engines at a later date ... those are the locomotives which must always be in operation for train movements during unloading operations.

All locomotives <u>not</u> owned and operated by Phillips must shut down <u>immediately</u> upon entering the refinery's grounds. The movement of trains and their impact on the community must be <u>Phillips'</u> responsibility.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

5. The Need For A Detailed Plan Regarding Phillips' Approach To Reducing Diesel Particulate Pollution Emanating From The Rail Terminal*

The EIR identified <u>diesel exhaust</u> at the refinery as a Class I impact. In response, Phillips presented a <u>slight-of-hand</u> approach that would make that impact <u>disappear</u>. This scheme includes ...

- Shutting down diesel locomotives when their fleet of sulfur and petcoke trucks is operating.
- Every day, waiting for strong afternoon winds to <u>blow away</u> the refinery's contaminants.
- Hoping those <u>east</u>-blowing winds containing contaminants <u>won't cross Highway 1</u> into communities.
- And only at that point they would start up the locomotives and offload crude oil from rail tankers.

All of this flies in the face of mathematics and logistics. The FEIR says, based on <u>three</u> locomotives per train, there will be at least <u>30 hours</u> of locomotive activity per day, with that activity spread over a <u>12-hour</u> period. Phillips also says they will not offload the trains after <u>7:00 PM</u>. How all of that interacts with the stopping and starting of trains and trucks and changing wind conditions is truly a <u>mystery</u>.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- Phillips must submit a highly detailed plan describing ...

- The numerical counts and specific activities of both their trains and trucks each day.
- The <u>anticipated emissions</u> for each of the various types of locomotives, trucks and other vehicles.
- The <u>timing</u> issues ... when and for how long will each type of vehicle be started and shut off.
- Documentation of afternoon wind <u>velocities</u> and <u>directions</u> at the terminal site.
- The exact impact on the <u>air pollution</u> all of this generates and could pass into local residences.
- And a plan for ongoing monitoring to ensure their plan works year after year, as conditions change.

6. No Diesel Locomotives Operated During Days Of Air Pollution Health Risk*

Repeatedly during these hearings it's been established that there are <u>already</u> many violations of the PM10 and PM 2.5 health standards on the Mesa, and that exhaust from diesel locomotives will only <u>add</u> to the <u>already</u> dirty air and make the health threat to the citizens of the Mesa even <u>higher</u>. No one has disputed that.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- no diesel locomotive will be operated on Phillips' property between <u>9 AM and 6 PM</u> on days where there is an <u>increased</u> health risk. Those are the hours of <u>peak</u> concentrations of fine particulate matter on the Mesa. This condition will apply on any day projected by the APCD to <u>exceed</u> the state air quality health standard for PM10 or PM 2.5 on the Nipomo Mesa.

Each day, Phillips must check with APCD to learn their projection of an air quality state health violation for the <u>next</u> day. If there is a violation expected, then diesel locomotives should not operate the next day, as indicated above.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

7. Restrictions On The Idling Of Trains*

Substantial evidence has been presented here regarding the <u>air</u>, <u>noise</u>, and <u>vibration</u> pollution the locomotives will generate onsite at the refinery ... all of which will occur every time the locomotives are operating.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- restrictions must be placed on the locomotives during their designated operational hours <u>if unforeseen conditions cause the train movements to fall outside the timing specified in the Final EIR</u> (see data on next page).

The current train movement timing specifies 1.14 engine-hours of idling at the East end of the tracks, and 13.66 engine-hours of idling on the West end of the tracks. Whenever conditions cause the specified timing to be exceeded by more than 30 minutes, the engines must shut down completely, within safety guidelines. The engines must only be restarted when the locomotives are ready for movement.

Ultimately, if actual movement of the trains shows that the approved timing is <u>frequently in error</u>, Phillips 66 will develop a <u>revised plan</u>. That plan would <u>not exceed</u> the already approved timing and not create even <u>greater</u> diesel emissions than originally approved. That would be so even if it requires Phillips 66 to procure more efficient switching locomotives, or to install an alternate power supply at the East end so that the engines can be shut down. This revised plan must be submitted to the County for approval.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

Locomotive Timing Calculations
Two Locomotive in the Head and One Locomotive in the Tail

Total Engine-hours		Sequence Step	Switching	Idling	Off	Total
0.28 0.57	Arrival-mainline:switching (1 engine) Arrival-east of rack;switching (2 engine)	Train Arrival Mainline Track				
0.48	Arrival-east of rack; switching (2 engine) Arrival-west of rack; switching (3 engines)	Locomotive 1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.85	Positioning -east of rack: switching (2 engines)	Locomotive 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.14	Positioning-east of rack: idle (2 engines)	Locomotive 3	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.28
0.21	Positioning-west of rack:switching (2 engines)	East of Rack				
0.26	Positioning-west of rack: idle (2 engines)	Locomotive 1	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.28
1.17	Unloading-rack 1: switch (all west of rack)	Locomotive 2	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.28
6.83	Unloading-rack 1: idle (all west of rack)	Locomotive 3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00 1.17	Unloading-rack 1:off (all west of rack) Unloading-rack 2: switch (all west of rack)	West of Rack Locomotive 1	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.16
6.83	Unloading-rack 2: idle (all west of rack)	Locomotive 2	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.16
0.00	Unloading-rack 2:off (all west of rack)	Locomotive 3	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.16
0.00	3rd engine-switching east of rack					
0.08	3rd engine-switching west of rack	Position Train on Track 1 and 2				
1.08	3rd engine-idle west of rack	East of Rack		_		
9.73	3rd engine-off west of rack	Locomotive 1	0.66	0.33	0.00	1.00
2.77	Pre-Departure-idling (all west of rack)(2 engines)	Locomotive 2	0.19	0.81	0.00	1.00
0.00 0.57	Pre-Departure-off (all west of rack)(2 engines) Departure-mainline:switching (2 engines)	West of Rack Locomotive 1	0.15	0.08	0.00	0.23
0.00	Departure-switching east of rack (1 engine)	Locomotive 2	0.06	0.18	0.00	0.23
0.48	Departure-switching west of rack (3 engines)	Locollouve 2	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.23
		Unloading				
		East of Rack				
0.15	% Switching offsite	Locomotive 1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Locomotive 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		West of Rack			0.00	0.00
0.85	Total Offsite Switching	Locomotive 1 Locomotive 2	1.17 1.17	6.83 6.83	0.00	8.00 8.00
5.00	Total Onsite Switching	Locomotive 2	1.17	0.03	0.00	8.00
18.92	Total idling	Third Locomotive				
9.73	Total off	East of Rack				
34.50	Total	Locomotive 3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		West of Rack				
0.28	Fraction of onsite switching east of rack	Locomotive 3	0.08	1.08	9.73	10.90
0.06	Fraction of idling east of rack					
0.243	Fraction of all switching east of rack	Idle Time Prior to Departure East of Rack				
0.243	Fraction of idling east of rack	Locomotive 1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	a nation of many cast of man	Locomotive 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2.58	Engine 1 & 2 switching, per engine	West of Rack				
8.92	Engine 1 & 2 idling, per engine	Locomotive 1	0.00	1.38	0.00	1.38
0.69	Engine 3 switching	Locomotive 2	0.00	1.38	0.00	1.38
1.08	Engine 3 idling					
		Train Departure				
		Mainline Track Locomotive 1	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.28
		Locomotive 1 Locomotive 2	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.28
		Locomotive 3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		East of Rack				
		Locomotive 1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Locomotive 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Locomotive 3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		West of Rack	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.16
		Locomotive 1 Locomotive 2	0.16 0.16	0.00	0.00	0.16 0.16
		Locomotive 3	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.16
			3.20			
			LM#1	LM #2	LM#3	
		Train Arrival	0.44	0.44	0.44	
		Position Train on Track 1 and 2	1.23	1.23	0.08	
		Third Locomotive Unloading	0.00	0.00	10.81	
		Unloading Idle Time Prior to Departure	8.00 1.38	8.00 1.38	0.00	
		Train Departure	0.44	0.44	0.16	
		Total	11.50	11.50	11.50	

Assumes third locomotive when at end of track 5 idles for 10% of time and is off 90% of time.

8. The Fence Line Around The Rail Terminal And Refinery Must Meet EPA Monitoring Standards*

Phillips' plan brings with it an entirely <u>new set</u> of air pollutants ... based on diesel exhaust, tar sands refining, and petroleum coke piles and dust.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- Phillips 66 must be required to submit a site-specific fence line monitoring and emergency response plan to SLO County APCD for review and approval.

The plan must comply with all Federal EPA and State Air Resources Board Standards of Performance and Emission Standards for refineries included in the Code of Federal Regulation Title 40, and California Code of Regulations Title 17. This includes monitoring, performance testing, record-keeping, and reporting of refinery emissions, including fugitive particulate matter, carbon monoxide, sulfur oxides, benzene, propane, butane and other volatile organic compounds and greenhouse gases.

The plan must include installation of state-of-the-art fence line monitoring equipment to provide publicly accessible fence line data similar to that provided at the Phillips 66 Rodeo refinery (see next page). It will also provide a training program for refinery personnel, and a protocol for rapid response when fence line monitoring detects fugitive gas and particulate aberrations.

http://www.enveraconsulting.com/petroleum-refinery-fenceline-monitoring/http://www.envstd.com/us-epa-proposal-requires-oil-refinery-fenceline-benzene-monitoring/http://www.fenceline.org/rodeo/data.php
40 CFR Part 60 Subpart J
40 CFR Part 60 Subpart Ja
43 CFR Part 63 Subpart CC
43 CFR Part 63 Subpart UUU
CCR Title 17 Sections 95100-95158

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

PHILLIPS 66 RODEO REFINERY FENCE LINE DATA

Ambient air quality data provided on the Phillips 66 Rodeo Refinery website is raw data at the time of collection – unchecked data that may contain errors

Message Board

07/27/2016 08:55 - At 8:31 pm last right the North FTIR reported a detection of mercaptan above CWS levels. The mercaptan detection occurred for a single five minute period and then was no longer detected. Upon receiving the notification, P66 shift operations reviewed all refinery operations and completed onsite and offsite patrols and found no indication of a release from the refinery. Argos has reviewed the data during this time period and after discussion with the equipment manufacture, determined the incident a false detection by the air monitoring system. Argos will continue to work with equipment manufacture to determine the root cause of the false detection and minimize the occurrence of future false detects.

Document Download Center

 22	100	(35)		

FTIR Systems			
Chemical (values in PPB)	South Fence Line	North Fence Line	
System Status	Online	Online	
Date	2016-08-04	2016-08-04	
Time	09:47:44	09:48:52	
1,3 Butadiene	ND	NE	
Carbonyl Sulfide	ND	NE	
Total Hydrocarbons	66	105	
Carbon Monoxide	ND	122	
Ethanol	ND	15	
Ethylene	ND	NE	
Nitrous Oxide	377	388	
Ammonia	ND	NE	
Mercaptan	ND	NE	
Methane	2827	3178	
мтве	ND	NE	

	UV Systems		
Chemical (values in PPB)	South Fence Line	North Fence Line	
System Status	Online	Online	
Signal Strength	2636	1621	
Date	2016-08-04	2016-08-04	
Time	09:45:29	09:46:56	
Benzene	ND	ND	
Carbon Disulfide	ND	ND	
Ozone	13	18	
Sulfur Dioxide	ND	ND	
Toluene	ND	ND	
Xylene	ND	ND	
	TDL Systems	,	
System Status	Online	Online	
Data Date	2016-08-04	-08-04 2016-08-04	
Data Time	09:47:22	09:45:56	
Signal Strength	6402	2322	
Hydrogen Sulfide	ND	NE	

Organic Gas Detectors (OGDs)		
Instrument (values in % LEL) System Status	% Level	
Data Time	09:49:37	
AT-1	0	0
AT-2	0	0
AT-3	0	0
AT-4	0	0
AT-5	0	0
AT-6	2.61	0

vveariei Cui	iditions
System Status	Online
Date	2016-08-04
Time	09:49:25
Temperature (°F)	57
Humidity (%)	83
Dew Point (°F)	52
Wind Speed (MPH)	11
Wind is blowing from	the SSW (198°)





Click on any chemical name or concentration for more detailed information

Background Colors

Abbreviations

Detected below CWS Limits: Green

ND - No Detect

Detected at or above CWS level II limit: Orange
Detected at or above CWS level III limit: Red

PPB - Parts per billion

% LEL - Percentage of Lower Explosive Limit

Local Resources

Phillips 66 San Francisco Refinery

1380 San Pablo Avenue Rodeo, CA 94572 Community Information Line: 510-245-4070 www.sfrefinery.com

This site is maintained and operated by <u>Argos Scientific</u>

Contact Argos Scientific

Contra Costa County Health Services Randall L Sawyer Hazardous Materials Programs Director 4585 Pacheco Bird. Suite 100 Martinez, CA 94553 925-335-3200 www.cchealth.org/groups/hazmat/

9. The Petroleum Coke From Tar Sands Must Be Studied And Its Dust Must Be Mitigated*

Petroleum coke is a byproduct of refining heavy crude. The <u>tar sands</u> that Phillips intends to refine here will also produce petcoke ... perhaps <u>even more</u> than the crude they currently process. Phillips' petcoke dust is <u>already</u> carried by onshore winds and breathed by residents. And petcoke, which contains heavy metals, is linked to respiratory issues, heart disease, and childhood cancers.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- Phillips must:

- 1. Provide a detailed, <u>independent analysis</u> of the <u>amount</u> of petcoke that will be generated by the refining of <u>tar sands</u> at its refinery. We cannot take their word that there will be less or the same amount.
- 2. Provide a plan showing how petcoke particulates will be <u>reduced or eliminated</u>. This is particularly critical because under their <u>new</u> method of operation, locomotives, buffer cars and tankers will <u>pass</u> <u>through</u> the petcoke fields, stirring up the fields and allowing far more dust to escape into the air. The "fluming" and further distribution of this dust caused by trains must not be allowed.
- 3. And if Phillips' solution is to wash down their tanker cars, how will the filthy water be <u>recovered</u> so that it doesn't leach into the Mesa's <u>groundwater</u>?

10. Limiting The Destruction Of The Buffer Zone*

The <u>closer</u> the rail terminal and its tracks are allowed to come to nearby homes, the more <u>impacts</u> residents will feel from the project ... including air, noise, light, odor and visual pollution, plus the dangers inherent in oil spills and fires.

It's been established at these hearings that Phillips intends to <u>remove</u> a major portion of the existing <u>buffer zone</u>, <u>regardless</u> of its impact on residents.

Also at these hearings, while the County staff described that the buffer zone is designed to <u>separate</u> industrial use from residential use ... there are no specific <u>numerical</u> standards set by the County. Indeed, the staff indicated that reduction of the buffer zone is a major reason for <u>rejecting</u> the project.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- the County will <u>reexamine</u> the issue of reduction of the buffer zone. The staff will determine in a far more <u>detailed</u> way, <u>why</u> the buffer zone remains critical, and steps Phillips must take to preserve a <u>far greater portion</u> of that zone.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

11. Increasing The Buffer Zone By Reducing The Length Of Crude Oil Trains*

Each train Phillips intends to bring into its refinery will have <u>80</u> tank cars. A train of that length has a direct bearing on the <u>length of the tracks</u> Phillips requires, and the <u>amount of land</u> that will be taken away from the current buffer zone.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- any train arriving at Phillips' refinery would be limited to hauling <u>60</u>, not 80 tankers. This would make the trains 25% shorter, and require <u>less</u> track length. It would thereby <u>increase</u> the amount of the remaining buffer.

Indeed, given that Phillips intends to continue receiving oil by <u>pipeline</u> and use rail for "optionality," this Commission should seriously consider limiting each train to <u>40</u>, not 80 cars ... i.e., a reduction of <u>50%</u> in the length of the trains. The Planning Commission should also determine whether moving shorter trains around the refinery will require fewer locomotives, thus <u>decreasing locomotive emissions</u>.

12. Onsite At The Refinery -- Specific Locomotive And Rail Terminal Shut Down Times*

Audio and video evidence has been presented at these hearing regarding how <u>intrusive</u> to neighbors the proposed trains and rail terminal would be ... including noise pollution, vibration pollution, and light pollution.

These would stem from the operations of <u>trains</u>, the <u>unloading</u> facilities, <u>trucks</u> and other machinery. All of these would harm the lives of thousands of neighbors ... especially during the <u>early evening</u> and <u>nighttime</u> hours. Indeed, needed sleep would be permanently disturbed ... leading to both physical and psychological issues.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- there must be a <u>hard shut-down time</u>. Both the trains and all rail terminal and unloading operations must <u>cease</u> from <u>early evening</u> until <u>first light</u>, giving citizens respite from the ongoing, daytime, invasive nature of what Phillips is proposing.

*However, no set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is unacceptable to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their primary duty is to protect the health and safety of our citizens, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

13. Strict Limitations On Noise Levels*

One of the most obvious impacts of Phillips' rail plan will be never-ending, <u>extreme noise</u> ... stemming from trains going over tracks, from train whistles, from cars uncoupling and coupling, from locomotives starting up, from locomotive engine vibrations, from machinery operations at the unloading facility, and from trucks and other onsite vehicles.

And the <u>cumulative</u> impact, as multiple sounds occur at the same time, is likely to be far greater.

Yet, noise testing during the EIR phase was terribly <u>flawed</u>. It did not come even close to simulating the <u>number</u> of trains and their movements, the actual unloading facility operations, and more.

Therefore, as a condition of approval --

- 1. Additional noise <u>testing</u> must be conducted that reflects actual rail yard situations, the actual number of tankers, and the actual uncoupling and coupling of cars -- <u>none</u> of which was conducted before.
- 2. Then, both maximum and average allowable <u>decibel levels</u> will be specified for all onsite rail terminal operations ... including noise from both the trains and the facilities. This will include separate specifications for the <u>daytime</u> (when the terminal is operating) and <u>nighttime</u> (when it is not).

The County Planning Department must identify specific enforcement <u>standards</u> for this condition and assign significant <u>penalties</u> for noncompliance with the standards.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

14. Creation Of Visual Models Of What The Rail Terminal Will Look Like*

Phillips intends to vastly change the use of its land by building five railroad tracks and an offloading facility. Yet, what <u>visual representations</u> have they shown Commissioners regarding what this invasive complex will <u>actually look like</u>?

After all, the <u>visual</u> impacts are critical components of this project, and Phillips has shown are a few <u>maps</u>. If <u>another</u> firm were proposing to build a warehouse or hotel complex, wouldn't Commissioners demand to see it first in extreme visual detail?

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- two types of comprehensive images of the proposed terminal must be created:

- First, a detailed <u>computer rendering</u> of the complete facility must be prepared and made available online.
- Secondly, a <u>3-dimensional</u>, physical, topological, scale model of the complete facility must be built. Such a model would be standard for any new large, sprawling facility, enabling officials and the public to examine the proposal as it will actually exist with far greater <u>perspective</u>.

The visuals must demonstrate what the project would look like from US 1 and public areas that look down at the site from across the highway ... i.e., the renderings must include the <u>neighboring</u> <u>communities</u>, shown at the <u>proper</u> height perspectives, including views from the elevations at <u>Louise Lane</u> and <u>Monarch Ridge</u> in Trilogy.

These visuals must include the trains, the berm, perimeter lighting, tracks, trucks and other vehicles, the unloading facility itself, and all other elements that come with the rail terminal. And they must enable a view of the facility from all <u>angles</u> and <u>elevations</u> ... including from all sides of the property and from above.

These visuals are to be examined by the Planning Commission and it's staff. The scale model must also be on public display in a County office for a specified period of time. Public comment will be held at a Planning Commission meeting. The commission will then determine any changes that Phillips would need to make prior to constructing the rail terminal.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

15. Installation Of Landscape Screening*

During these hearings Commissioners have been shown many visuals of what <u>other</u> rail terminals look like ... with mile-long chains of black oil tankers, crisscrossing tracks, oil offloading facilities, attending vehicles, etc. Approval of <u>this</u> project will result in similar visual destruction of what is currently a scenic vista.

The public must be <u>compensated</u> for this destruction ... and the destruction must be <u>minimized</u>.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- <u>prior</u> to beginning construction of the terminal, Phillips must plant an extensive number of <u>trees</u> and other shrubs along the fenced perimeter of Highway 1, as well as within other areas of the terminal ... <u>wherever</u> there will be visual impacts. The trees must all be <u>fully-grown and tall</u> ... not saplings that will take a decade or more to grow to acceptable height. All trees and shrubs must be <u>evergreen</u>.

And Phillips must be responsible for proper landscape <u>maintenance</u> and any replacements of trees/ shrubs as long as the rail terminal exists. A plan for ongoing maintenance must be submitted to, and reviewed and approved by the County Planning Department.

The County Planning Department must identify specific enforcement <u>standards</u> for this condition and assign significant <u>penalties</u> for noncompliance with the standards.

16. A Berm That Is Far Higher Than Indicated In The Final EIR*

As testified at these hearings -- there was <u>inadequate</u> testing during the EIR process to determine the rail operations' <u>visual impact</u> on neighbors. Even though Trilogy's roads are <u>public</u> roads at a <u>high elevation</u>, they were <u>not</u> taken into account regarding visual impacts. This was <u>confirmed</u> by County staff. So measuring the impact only from Highway 1, a far <u>lower</u> location, <u>erroneously</u> calculates the impacts for residents.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- <u>new</u> visual tests must be done from the proper elevations. Then, the 20-foot high <u>berm</u> that Phillips proposes must be specified to be at a far <u>greater</u> height. Only then <u>might</u> we begin to mitigate the noise and incredibly ugly visual impacts that come with a crude oil rail terminal.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

17. Reduced Lighting At Night*

After dark, due to operational and security issues, the rail terminal will be lit up like a <u>baseball</u> stadium ... both within its perimeter and along its miles of fence lines. This will of course be a source of incredible <u>light pollution</u> to nearby residents who look down upon the entire refinery.

Therefore, as conditions of approval --

- 1. Before any final lighting plans are approved, <u>sample</u> light towers or fixtures must be erected at the <u>actual locations</u> of the rail terminal and perimeter. They must be <u>tested</u> to see their actual impact on residents ... and they must be tested in all atmospheric conditions including <u>fog</u>. Adjustments to the lighting plan must be made as appropriate.
- 2. The <u>height</u> of the light towers must also be tested. The height of those towers must be as <u>low</u> as possible to minimize their effect on neighboring residences.
- 3. All lights related to the rail terminal must be "down-shaded" ... that is, pointed down.
- 4. Lastly, when operations are not going on, lights in appropriate areas must be <u>shut off</u>, especially at night. Where perimeter lights are used for security, they should be used in conjunction with a <u>motion detection</u> system ... i.e., illuminated at night <u>only</u> when motion is detected.

18. Odors From The Crude Oil Unloading Facility Must Be Monitored And Contained*

As you know, exposed crude oil has a distinctly <u>noxious</u> smell. With crude oil arriving by <u>pipeline</u>, there is no exposed crude oil at Phillips refinery.

However, with Phillips' proposal, oil <u>will be</u> exposed as it's transferred from rail tankers to the company's storage facilities. Indeed, now that Phillips is transferring oil out of <u>trucks</u>, residents have noticed far greater odor pollution. And with far <u>greater</u> quantities of oil being pumped out of <u>rail</u> tankers, there will also be substantial odors escaping and carried by onshore winds into local communities.

Therefore, as conditions of approval:

- 1. Research must be conducted to determine the type and strength of the <u>odors</u> that would emanate from <u>tar sands</u> (during the unloading and refining processes) and the resulting <u>petcoke</u>.
- 2. Research must be conducted to determine the <u>maximum allowable odor</u> for the rail terminal.
- 3. A <u>monitoring system</u> must be put in place to measure odors on an ongoing basis, with <u>penalties</u> put in place for violations.
- 4. And, a <u>vapor recovery system</u> must be installed, to reduce the odors.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

19. Onsite At The Refinery -- Utilization Of Only State-Of-The-Art Crude Oil Tankers*

Evidence has been presented here about how even the <u>latest</u> crude oil tankers <u>cannot</u> prevent rupture and spills during derailments. Even the very latest DOT-117 cars are extremely vulnerable to rupture when traveling at any <u>significant</u> speed.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- at the Nipomo refinery, only <u>state-of-the-art</u> crude oil tankers will be allowed on the refinery's grounds. This will be the case whether the cars are DOT-117 models or whatever the safest cars are specified by the federal government at any given time.

The cars must include the latest available technology. As per Commissioner Jim Irving -- "The cars must have all the 'bells and whistles'."

Even if federal regulations give companies additional years to implement state-of-the-art tankers, Phillips <u>must not delay</u> to that date. They must <u>immediately</u> purchase/lease those model cars or retrofit existing cars to meet the highest-known standards, regardless of cost, and regardless of future deadlines for implementing new tanker models.

20. Onsite At The Refinery -All Trains Must Be Equipped With Positive Train Control Braking Systems*

Ample evidence has been presented at these hearings regarding the extreme dangers of shipping crude by <u>rail</u>, at <u>any</u> speed. The causes are human error, mechanical failure, track failure, and many others. To date, the railroad companies have proven to be woefully <u>unable</u> to prevent crude oil train accidents.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- the trains operating onsite at the Nipomo refinery, <u>regardless</u> of their speed, must have the latest available "<u>positive train control</u>" (PTC) braking systems. These must be utilized from the day the rail terminal is completed. And regardless of the cost to Phillips, PTC braking systems must be utilized by trains moving around the refinery.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

21. The Training That Phillips Workers Must Have When Working Under A Crude-By-Rail Delivery Model Must Be Specified In Detail*

For the last 60 years the Nipomo refinery has received its crude by a relatively <u>safe</u>, <u>pipeline</u> system. Under Phillips' new model, for the <u>first</u> time crude would arrive by <u>rail</u> and then be transferred using a new offloading facility.

This new model is far more <u>complex</u>, involves more <u>dangerous</u> vehicles and machinery, and carries far greater opportunities for <u>accidents</u> impacting employees and residents. However, Phillips has not <u>trained</u> its Nipomo employees for crude-by-rail, nor has it addressed training issues at these <u>hearings</u>.

Therefore, as conditions of approval --

- Phillips must submit a comprehensive <u>training program</u> for their crude oil rail operations workers for approval by SLO County.
- The plan must specify mandatory <u>competencies</u> and detail how those competencies will be learned and demonstrated. As a minimum the training must comply with OSHA protocols, plus state and local requirements.
- The plan must specify the number of hours of <u>classroom</u> and <u>practical</u> training to be <u>initially</u> completed, as well as the types and timing of ongoing <u>refresher</u> training. Only OSHA-certified instructors would deliver this training.
- And, there must be periodic worker testing to ensure they've mastered the competencies.

22. An Enforcement Fund And Random Inspections By The County To Ensure Compliance With Conditions Of Approval*

Phillips has shown they will attempt to get away with <u>whatever</u> they can. For example, first they wanted to leave the door open for rail delivery of <u>Bakken</u> crude to the refinery. Then they wanted to bring in <u>five</u> trains per week to the facility. Only citizens' objections caused them to <u>back down</u> from those plans.

So, as Commissioner Ken Topping stated here -- "I don't see how you could avoid funding a permanent monitoring program that <u>maintains vigilance</u>." In other words, we cannot rely on Phillips to be its own policeman regarding ongoing implementation of the imposed conditions.

Therefore, an annual <u>enforcement fund</u> must be established, paid for by <u>Phillips</u>. The County will use that fund for personnel, equipment and systems to monitor the rail terminal operations on a permanent basis, both with regular reporting and with <u>random</u>, <u>unannounced</u> inspections. The fund would be required to <u>expand</u> if the monitoring needs changes over time or if costs increase, this too paid for by Phillips.

Where circumstances warrant, the County will refer issues or violations to <u>other</u> counties or federal agencies for action. Costs for such additional reviews and oversight will be assessed to Phillips.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

23. Phillips Must Pay To Relocate Schools In The Blast Zone*

If towns had known that railroads would be used to ship flammable crude oil, they <u>never</u> would have built schools near railroad tracks.

In SLO County, there are a number of schools in the half-mile "evacuation zone" where they will be impacted by fires, explosions and poisonous air from crude oil train derailments, and the one-mile "impact zone" where they will be impacted by the effects of fires such as toxic smoke. That is why local teachers have <u>vehemently</u> objected to Phillips' plan, which will put their students in danger.

Therefore as a condition of approval -- Phillips will pay to <u>relocate</u> SLO County schools that are within the evacuation and impact zones. They will pay for purchasing new <u>land</u> and pay for building the new <u>facilities</u>. This must be completed within five years, starting the day that Phillips starts construction of the rail terminal. And, if our Commissioners think this is an <u>unreasonable</u> condition, they must talk to the citizens of Mt. Vernon, Washington. They just approved a \$106 million bond to <u>relocate</u> their elementary school out of the blast zone.

24. Phillips Must Pay To Train Teachers About Response To Crude Oil Train Derailments*

Teachers have consistently complained that they have no <u>skills</u> or <u>training</u> in how to respond to a crude oil train derailment near their schools ... including impact from the trains into school buildings, oil spills, fires, explosions, smoke, etc.

Therefore as a condition of approval -- Phillips will pay for the <u>training of all teachers</u> in SLO County to be able to respond to crude oil train derailment emergencies.

In addition, Phillips will provide a grant to SLO County Schools to develop <u>annual student training</u> and a <u>simulated drill</u> regarding student safety in event of an oil train disaster. This grant must include hiring an expert with experience in this type of training, who will either conduct the training or teach others to do so. The County Planning Department will determine the appropriate amount of this grant.

*However, no set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is unacceptable to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their primary duty is to protect the health and safety of our citizens, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

25. Phillips Must Pay For Updated Hospital Disaster Preparedness And County-Wide Drills*

As many towns and cities have unfortunately learned, crude oil train disasters are not a matter of "if" but "when." And <u>when</u> it happens, too often those municipalities find themselves <u>under-prepared</u> to handle the <u>intensity</u> and <u>scope</u> of the disaster.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- Phillips must provide a grant to all SLO County <u>hospitals</u> and <u>emergency care facilities</u> to update their <u>disaster preparedness plans</u> to take into account oil train accidents and the impacts of spills, fires, explosions, toxic smoke and other serious injuries. The upgraded disaster plans must reflect handling <u>many dozens or hundreds</u> of injured citizens and first responders at the same time.

Given that developing and implementing upgraded disaster plans can take a number of years, Phillips must provide the grant <u>prior</u> to starting construction of the rail terminal.

In addition, a county-wide oil train disaster <u>drill</u> must be conducted <u>annually</u>, that includes, fire, police, hospitals and any other essential services to test plans in a simulated but coordinated fashion. The expense must be covered by Phillips each year. Phillips would be a participant but may not lead the annual drill.

The grant amount and the costs for ongoing drills will be determined by the County Planning Department.

26. Phillips Must Pay To Train All Emergency Service Responders In SLO County*

It has been shown that fire and police departments are <u>unprepared</u>, <u>undertrained</u> and <u>under-funded</u> to handle disasters from crude oil train derailments. SLO County is no different.

Therefore as a condition of approval -- Phillips will pay for all emergency responders in SLO County (police, fire departments and emergency medical service teams in <u>all towns</u> through which their crude oil tankers will travel) to go to specialized oil train derailment/accident training programs. This will include <u>ongoing</u> training as new approaches come online year after year.

In addition, responders must be trained on how to get citizens who need care, from <u>one</u> side of tracks that are <u>blocked</u> due to a derailment, to the <u>other</u> side so they can be taken to hospitals. For example, if the tracks that bisect Grover Beach at Grand Avenue, <u>block</u> traffic from one side to the other ... what is the <u>plan</u> to get people who need care to emergency rooms?

Phillips must pay for all travel expenses as well as all training programs and related plans. All training programs must be of the <u>highest</u> caliber certifications.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

27. Phillips Must Pay For Firefighting Foam & Equipment*

As shown in the Mosier, Oregon derailment -- firefighting foam has <u>little</u> or <u>no</u> effect when crude oil fires are initially burning out of control ... the foam simply <u>evaporates</u>. However, foam is of help at <u>later</u> stages after much of the fire has burned out. In SLO County, there are <u>not</u> sufficient supplies of foam and related equipment, and they are not located in <u>all towns</u> along the mainline.

Therefore as a condition of approval -- for as long as the rail terminal exists, Phillips must pay for ample supplies of fire-fighting foam to be located in <u>every town</u> along the mainline route in SLO County ... i.e., a sufficient amount to fight a major crude oil fire stemming from a derailment. And they must pay for the <u>equipment and training</u> of each town's responders on the proper use of foam.

28. Phillips Must Post A Bond To Address The Issue Of Potential Damage To Residents, Property And The Environment*

Many times, Phillips and their public relations staff have told us they would <u>not</u> be responsible if their tankers derail and cause damage and injuries along the <u>mainline</u>. They would point the finger at <u>Union Pacific</u> and tell us to call the railroad.

But what happens if Phillips rail <u>terminal</u> facilities or trains on <u>refinery property</u> cause injuries or death to members of the public, or damage to other peoples' property or to the environment? This could include fire, smoke, oil spills or other destruction. <u>Who</u> are we going to call and who <u>pays</u> for it all?

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- Phillips must bear <u>financial responsibility</u> for all injuries and damages of all types stemming from the <u>onsite</u> trains and rail terminal, and for remedying it all to residents' satisfaction. And to ensure that this occurs, Phillips would be required to <u>post a bond</u> of substantial size to address this issue. The County Planning Department will determine the size of the bond.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

29. An Array Of Conditions Must Be Imposed During Construction Of The Rail Terminal*

If this project ever enters the <u>construction</u> stage, it will cause six months of <u>havoc and danger</u> for thousands of citizens living on the Mesa. They will be faced with truck traffic from construction vehicles, loud noise from the construction of both the railroad tracks and unloading facility, additional air pollution from construction vehicles, and visual and light pollution from an extremely complex and busy construction site.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- our Commissioners must impose stringent conditions for the project's construction stage, helping limit impacts to local residents.

This would include, but not be limited to restricting the days and hours of construction, limiting the light and noise emanating from the site, monitoring air pollution from the activities, and, prior to construction -- planting trees and shrubbery and building a berm to help block out the noise and visual pollution of the construction site. Plus, random inspections of the site by County personnel must be made to be sure that all conditions are being adhered to during the <u>construction</u> phase.

30. Each Month There Will Be A Complete Review Of All Impacts And Compliance Issues*

SLO County has <u>never</u> had a crude oil rail terminal and County officials have <u>no</u> experience or education in <u>regulating</u> one. Yet, Phillips is telling officials there will be <u>no</u> significant and unavoidable <u>impacts</u>, and that they will <u>comply</u> with all mitigations and conditions of approval.

Therefore as a condition of approval -- beginning with the completion of the rail terminal -- each month there will be a <u>detailed analysis</u> of all <u>actual</u> impacts mentioned in the Final EIR (air, noise, light, odor pollution, oil spills, etc.) and all conditions of approval. The review will <u>compare</u> actual performance with <u>thresholds</u> and <u>expectations</u>. This review will be conducted by the County and paid-for by Phillips 66.

Wherever there are impacts that go <u>beyond</u> the thresholds stated in the FEIR, or where Phillips is in <u>noncompliance</u> with conditions, they must resubmit plans and state how and when they will mitigate issues and/or come into compliance.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.

31. Phillips Must Maintain A Complaint Line For Use By The Public And Respond In A Timely Manner*

Phillips' crude-by-rail strategy will result in numerous <u>environmental</u> impacts, including air pollution, odors, lighting, visual and noise impacts. It is clearly foreseeable that many times in the future Phillips will be in <u>noncompliance</u> with standards set to minimize these impacts.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- Phillips must operate a <u>manned</u>, 24-hour <u>complaint</u> phone line for the public's use both during construction of the rail terminal and into the future. They must advertise the availability of the line to the public. A Phillips' employee must <u>promptly respond directly</u> to the caller with an answer and solution (e.g., within two hours). And, <u>records</u> of all complaints and how they were handled must be submitted to the County on a quarterly basis.

<u>Penalties</u>, paid by Phillips, must be developed and assessed by the County Planning Department for noncompliance with handling citizens' complaints.

32. If Phillips Rejects Or Defeats Any Conditions Of Approval, The County Must Adopt A "Poison Pill"*

Together, this commission and our County's citizens are developing a critical list of stipulations which we believe Phillips <u>must</u> adhere to regarding their rail terminal. However, for one reason or another, <u>after</u> this Commission finalizes them, Phillips or other entities may cause those conditions to be abandoned.

Therefore, as a condition of approval -- SLO County's Deputy Counsel recommended that the conditions include a "poison pill" ... that if <u>any one</u> of the conditions are found not to be valid or enforceable, approval of the <u>entire</u> project, prior to construction of the terminal, will be <u>withdrawn</u> by the County.

SLO County Citizens in opposition to the project <u>overwhelmingly agree</u> with this poison pill stipulation. As the representatives of <u>citizens</u>, our Planning Commissioners <u>must</u> include this condition.

*However, <u>no</u> set of conditions will effectively mitigate the 10 Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts of the project under the "three train alternative." Phillips' rail terminal project in its entirety is <u>unacceptable</u> to our County's citizens and voters. We respectfully ask our Planning Commissioners to remember that their <u>primary duty</u> is to protect the health and safety of our <u>citizens</u>, and therefore reject this oppressive project.